

**Remarks**

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed November 16, 2007 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-16, 18, 20-22. Claims 1, 14, 15, and 21 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 8, 10, 17, 19, and 23-45 have been cancelled.

In this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 23-45 from further consideration in this Application. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by these claims prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the documents of record in the present application. Claims 1, 14, 15, and 21 were amended and claims 23-45 were cancelled in this Amendment to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the Application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims including subject matter encompassed by these claims, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications as permitted by any applicable rules.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 14 has been amended to correct the typographical error indicated in the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to delete the subject matter asserted as not being described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time that the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection of claims 1 and 21 is respectfully solicited.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-16, 18, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No: US 2003/0088520 (Bohrer). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Turning initially to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information, wherein the content object comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article by an author, wherein the unrestricted portion of the content object including a title, an abstract, and a description, and wherein the restricted information comprises personal identification information of the author...”

Applicant respectfully submits that Bohrer does not teach or suggest that the content object comprises one of a white paper, a case study, a press release, and an article by an author and that the unrestricted portion of the content object includes a title, an abstract, and a description. Applicant further respectfully submits that Bohrer does not teach or suggest that the restricted information of the content object comprises personal identification information of the author.

Claim 1 also recites:

“parsing the content object to provide access to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences in response to the content object being collected to satisfy a request...”

The Office Action beginning on page 4 cited portions of paragraphs [0044], [0046], [0078] and [0081] of Bohrer in rejecting claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Bohrer does not teach or suggest a content object as defined in the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claims 1 above. Further, Bohrer does not specifically teach or suggest parsing let alone parsing the content object as defined in claim 1. The Office Action on page 4 merely asserts that in order to apply the referenced “Privacy Preference Rule” to the “Access List,” the “Privacy Preference Rule” must be parsed. Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in Bohrer or the paragraphs specifically cited in rejecting claim 1 does Bohrer teach or suggest parsing. Even if it could be successfully argued that Bohrer teaches parsing, the “Privacy Preference Rule,” Applicant respectfully submits that the content object as recited in claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the “Privacy Preference Rule” of Bohrer.

For all of the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over Bohrer, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4-7, 9, and 11-14, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, include all of the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of independent claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bohrer, claim 15 has been amended to recite:

“replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information in response to the privacy preferences or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the content provider’s policies, wherein the content provider collects the content object and has access to the private or restricted information...”

In rejecting these features of claim 15, the Office Action on page 9 cited Figures 4A and 4B and paragraph [0081] of Bohrer as teaching, “A data response is either a denial if the request cannot be fulfilled, or the subset of specific data items which were requested and authorized.” The Office Action also cited Figure 5 and paragraph [0082] of Bohrer as teaching, “If the result is den[ied], then data item is not included in the list of data items to be returned in the response 511.” The Office Action in rejecting these features of claim 15 further cited Figure 7 and paragraph [0088] of Bohrer as reciting, “FIG. 7 is a flow diagram of a routine that enables a gather and filtering process carried out to collect data to be returned to a data requester.” Accordingly, Bohrer teaches that the data request is denied, a subset of the specific data items requested are returned, or the data item is not included in the returned response, or a filtering process is carried out. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Bohrer of replacing private or restricted information with default or generic information in response to the privacy preference or other restriction preferences being inconsistent with the

content provider's policies as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in independent claim 15 as amended. Therefore, claim 15 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of independent claim 15 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 16, 18, and 20-22, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 15. Because of this dependency, these claims include all of the features of independent claim 15. Therefore, claims 16, 18, and 20-22 are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinct over Bohrer, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of claims 16, 18, and 20-22 is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Entry of this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 is respectfully requested in that this amendment cancels at least one claim and renders the remaining claims in condition for allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date are respectfully requested.


In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this Amendment, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels, et al.  
(Applicant)

Date: January 17, 2008

By: 

Charles L. Moore  
Registration No. 33,742  
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, N.C. 27560  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199